

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	LICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAM		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/773,061	01/30/2001	Neal A. Osborn	PALM-3285.US.P 60			
75	90 03/25/2005	EXAMINER				
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Two North Market Street, Third Floor San Jose, CA 95113			PAN, Y	PAN, YUWEN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
C , C			2682			
			DATE MAILED: 03/25/200	DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/773,00		OSBORN ET AL.			
		Examine	•	Art Unit			
		Yuwen P	an	2682			
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communicati Reply	ion appears on the	e cover sheet with the	correspondence add	dress		
A SHOLTHE MA - Extension after SI - If the pecine - If NO pecine - Failure - Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 K (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dayeriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no evation. ys, a reply within the stat y period will apply and w by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be t utory minimum of thirty (30) da ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron lication to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered timely the mailing date of this co (ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>08 November 2</u>	<u>004</u> .				
2a)⊠ T	his action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is n	on-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositio	n of Claims						
4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	laim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the appliance of the above claim(s) is/are wellaim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from co					
Applicatio	n Papers						
9) <u></u> ⊤⊦	ne specification is objected to by the Ex	caminer.					
10)[] Th)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	pplicant may not request that any objection						
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the ne oath or declaration is objected to by	•	- · ·	·	- *		
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) [cknowledgment is made of a claim for f All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority doce Certified copies of the priority doce Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International I the attached detailed Office action for	uments have bee uments have bee ne priority docume Bureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applica ents have been receive 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National S	Stage		
Attachment(s	1						
	/ of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notice o	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9		Paper No(s)/Mail [Date	152)		
	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO lo(s)/Mail Date	/SB/08)	6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO	-132)		

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/8/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that prior art of record, Bell reference, doesn't permit a "user selection". The examiner respectfully disagrees because first of all, a user selection step must be present during the applicant described invention. It could be chaos when a user with a fully automatic communication device, such as PDA in to a meeting, everyone in the meeting could get user's information without permission. Then, Bell doesteach that a user selection (see column 5 and lines 60-64). Further, the applicant argues that:

"The rejection acknowledges that Bell does not teach, suggest or disclose the limitations of "second electronic device automatically displaying a message indicating a user selection." Consequently, Bell cannot teach, suggest or disclose any action responsive to such non-existent user selection, such as the limitation of automatically communicating a second message of the same type, as recited in the instant claims."

Based on the applicant foregoing statement, since Bell explicitly teaches the permission of user selection. It is legitimately to combine the teaching of McGaughey where in response to previous step, said second electronic device automatically displaying a message indicating a user selection.

The applicant further argues that:

"With respect to Claims 13 and 19, McGaughey do not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitations of Wherein step c) comprises the step of said second electronic device allowing a user to select between: 1) accepting said first electronic business card; 2) rejecting said first electronic business card; and 3)

accepting said first electronic business card and automatically transmitting said second electronic business

card" as recited by Claims 13 and 19."

Again, this argument is still around the "user selection". The difference between Bell's invention

and applicant's is that Bell teaches the user selection prior to the initial of session and applicant's

is during a session. So MchGaughey reference teaches that user could select which mode during

a session.

Whether which mode to choose, either accepting only, rejecting only or swapping is same as

Push, Pull or Push and Pull by using the Bluetooth object (see Bell column 6 and lines 46-56).

Thus, although Bell doesn't teach in response to previous step, said second electronic device

automatically displaying a message indicating a user selection, Bell still teaches the feature of

user selection.

In light of foregoing, the previous rejection of the applicant's application stands.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell

(US006600902B1) in view of McGaughey, III et al (US Patent #: 4,977,520), hereinafter

McGaughey.

Art Unit: 2682

Per claim 1 and 8, 14, Bell discloses a method of communicating information comprising the steps of:

Communicating a first electronic business card from a first electronic device to a second electronic device using a wireless communication mechanism (see figure 3 and items 31-43, column 5 and lines 10-23);

Said second electronic device receiving said first electronic business card (see figure 3 and items 46);

Responsive to said user selection, said second electronic device storing said first electronic business card and automatically communicating a second electronic business card to said first electronic device (see column 6 and lines 45-65).

One portable electronic device (see figure 2 and item 3) comprising:

A processor coupled to a bus (see figure 2 and item 24);

A transmitter and a receiver (see figure 2 and items 20-23);

A display screen (see figure 2 and item 28);

A memory coupled to said bus and comprising instructions that implement a method of communicating information (see figure 2 and item 25 and 26).

Bell doesn't teach that in response to previous step, said second electronic device automatically displaying a message indicating a user selection.

McGaughey teaches that in response to previous step, said second electronic device automatically displaying a message indicating a user selection (see abstract, column 4 and lines 34-48).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of McGaughey with Bell's method such that it permits a user to interact with the exchanging information by selecting one of the options.

With respect to claims 2,3 and 9,10, 15,16, Bell further discloses said wireless communication mechanism is infrared communication and substantially compatible with a Bluetooth communication protocol (see column 4 and lines 48-53).

With respect to claims 4,11, 17, Bell further discloses first and second electronic devices are both palm-sized computer (see column 4 and lines 46).

With respect to claims 5 and 6, Bell further discloses calendar information and an electronic business card (see column 3 and lines 30-33).

With respect to claim 7, Bell further discloses data base files (see figure 2, item 27).

With respect to claims 12 and 18, Bell further discloses that said first electronic business card represents and owner of said first electronic device and wherein said second electronic business card represents an owner of said second electronic device (see column 5 and lines 59-65).

With respect to claim 13 and 19, Bell further discloses the step of said second electronic device allowing a user to select between: 1) accepting said first electronic business card; 2) rejecting said first electronic business card; and 3) accepting said first electronic business card and automatically transmitting said second electronic business card (see column 6 and lines 46-65).

With respect to claim 20, Bell further discloses that said display screen is a liquid crystal display screen (see figure 2 and item 28).

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yuwen Pan whose telephone number is 703-305-7372. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 703-308-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/773,061

Art Unit: 2682

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 18, 2005

Page 7